

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
CORY COPELIN,

Plaintiff,

-against-

P.O. L. MARTINEZ, #1798, S.P.O. C.  
GUADALUPE-SMITH, HEARING OFFICER  
CHANDRA PERRY-PATTERSON, BILL  
HENDERSON, JOHN DOE, *Hearing Officer*,

Defendants.  
-----X

FEUERSTEIN, J.

**ORDER**

13-CV-5570 (SJF)(AKT)

**FILED**  
IN CLERK'S OFFICE  
U S DISTRICT COURT E D N Y

★ JUN 18 2014 ★

**LONG ISLAND OFFICE**

October 2, 2013, *pro se* plaintiff Cory Copelin ("plaintiff") commenced this action against P.O.L. Martinez, S.P.O.C. Guadalupe-Smith, Hearing Officer Chandra Perry-Patterson, Bill Henderson, and John Doe ("defendants"), alleging civil rights violations pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. [Docket Entry No. 1].

Presently before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (the "Report") of Magistrate Judge A. Kathleen Tomlinson, dated October 21, 2013, recommending that this case be dismissed for plaintiff's failure to prosecute. [Docket Entry No. 41]. No objections to the Report have been filed. For the following reasons, the Court accepts Magistrate Judge Tomlinson's Report in its entirety.

I. Standard of Review

Any portion of a report and recommendation on dispositive matters to which a timely objection has been made is reviewed *de novo*. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The Court, however, is not required to review the factual findings or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to which no proper objections are interposed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S.

140, 150, 106 S.Ct. 466, 88 L.Ed.2d 435 (1985). To accept the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge on a dispositive matter to which no timely objection has been made, the district judge need only be satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *Johnson v. Goord*, 487 F. Supp. 2d 377, 379 (S.D.N.Y. 2007), *aff'd*, 305 F. App'x 815 (2d Cir. Jan. 9, 2009); *Baptichon v. Nevada State Bank*, 304 F. Supp. 2d 451, 453 (E.D.N.Y. 2004), *aff'd*, 125 F. App'x 374 (2d Cir. Apr. 13, 2005). Whether or not proper objections have been filed, the district judge may, after review, accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

## II. Discussion

No objections to Magistrate Judge Tomlinson's Report have been filed. Upon review, the Court is satisfied that the Report is not facially erroneous. Accordingly, the Court accepts Magistrate Judge Tomlinson's Report and Recommendation in its entirety. This case is dismissed with prejudice for plaintiff's failure to prosecute, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), and the Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

In accordance with Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Clerk of Court shall serve a copy of this order upon all parties, including mailing a copy of this order to the *pro se* plaintiff, and shall record such service on the docket.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/ Sandra J. Feuerstein

---

Sandra J. Feuerstein  
United States District Judge

Dated: June 18, 2014  
Central Islip, New York